Application No.: 10/049,889 2 Docket No.: 449122021200

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Silver, U.S. Patent 6,240,174. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response to Applicant's response filed on July 12, 2004, the Examiner asserts that EMS server 431 of Silver corresponds to one service device and that regional IPs 405, 415 and 425 of Silver are the remaining service devices of the pending claims. The Examiner also asserts that the EMS server inherently maintains an address list including the addresses of the regional IPs because the EMS needs to have the addresses of the IPs in order to send update information for the subscribers (citing col. 6, lines 25-44). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to claim 1, the service devices are arranged in a decentralized manner, whereas element 431 of Silver is a central device EMS, as is evident from the disclosure of Silver. For instance, Silver states that the EMS is a central interface machine to the IP systems (col. 6, lines 25-26). Further, Silver states that IPs 405, 415 and 425 are regional IPs and accept updates from the EMS database, but there is no communication between the regional IPs (col. 7, lines 35-40). This is further evidence that EMS 431 is a central device. EMS 431 is an essential (or central) element to the system disclosed in Silver and all updates pass through the EMS, and is not a decentralized service device. Since the IPs 405, 415 and 425 do not communicate with each other, it would be impossible for one of them to report a change throughout the network to other service devices (as claimed in claim 1).

Furthermore, although the Examiner asserts that the EMS 431 maintains lists of the addresses of all IPs in the network, this is not what is being claimed. Rather, claim 1 recites that for each data record which is stored in one of the service devices, a list of addresses of the other service devices is stored, where the list contains the data record. Thus, the service devices do not maintain address lists for all IPs, as in Silver, but only a portion thereof, namely the addresses of the IPs that maintain the applicable dataset.

For at least the above reasons, the features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Silver.

Claim 2 recites that the service devices are included in the peripherals of a communications system. The IPs disclosed in Silver are not included in the peripherals of a communication system. Rather, the IPs of Silver are defined as network units according to the definition of intelligent networks. In fact, Silver states that the IPs are merely linked to a communication system (abstract), and are therefore not a part of the communication system. If the opposite were the case, it would not be necessary to update the user-specific data (col. 16-18); rather it would be sufficient to access the system's internal database. Thus, the features of claim 2 are not taught or suggested by Silver.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Application No.: 10/049,889 4 Docket No.: 449122021200

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 449122021200.

Dated: January 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300 McLean, Virginia 22102

(202) 778-1646